



# Second Language Acquisition

*and*

# English Language Teaching

*Editor*

*Bambang Yudi Cahyono*



# **Second Language Acquisition *and* English Language Teaching**

*Editor*

**Bambang Yudi Cahyono**  
*State University of Malang, Indonesia*



**State University of Malang Press**

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means – electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of State University of Malang Press.

Cahyono, B. Y. *Second Language Acquisition and English Language Teaching*—By: Bambang Yudi Cahyono—First Printing—Malang: State University of Malang Press, 2010.

262, xxviii pages, 23 cm

ISBN: 979-495-928-6

© State University of Malang Press, 2010

Cover Design : Yusuf

Layout : Yusuf

---

**Printed and Published by**

**State University of Malang Press**

Member of the Indonesian Publishers Association (IKAPI) No. 059/JTI/89

Jalan Semarang 5 Malang, Post Code 65145, Indonesia

Telephone 62-341-551312, ext. 453, Fax 62-341-566025

E-mail: penerbit@malang.ac.id

---

First Printing 2010

---

Printed in the Republic of Indonesia

## CONTENTS

|  |  |      |
|--|--|------|
| Contents .....   |  | v    |
| Contributors .....   |  | ix   |
| About the Editor .....   |  | xiii |
| Foreword .....   |  | xv   |
| Introduction: Second Language Acquisition and<br>English Language Teaching<br><i>Bambang Yudi Cahyono, State University of Malang,<br/>East Java</i> ..... |  | xvii |
| <br>   |  |      |
| Chapter 1  | Improving the Listening Skill of EFL Learners<br>Using Games<br><i>Ahmad Ghufan Ferdiant</i> .....   | 1    |
| Chapter 2  | Form-focused and Meaning-focused Instruction Model<br>to Promote Speaking Ability in an EFL Classroom<br><i>Dwi Ima Herminingsih</i> ..... | 11   |
| Chapter 3  | Communication Strategies Used by EFL Learners<br>of Different Sexes<br><i>Azhar Kasim Nasution</i> .....                                   | 21   |
| Chapter 4  | Cultural Transfer in English Speech Texts of<br>EFL Learners<br><i>Erfan</i> .....   | 35   |
| Chapter 5  | EFL Learners' Home Reading Activities<br><i>Erna Iftanti</i> .....   | 43   |
| Chapter 6  | EFL Learners' Reading Strategies and Understanding<br>of Reading Texts<br><i>Cayandrawati Sutiono</i> .....                                | 59   |

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Chapter 7  | Developing EFL Learners' reading Ability by Using WebQuests: An Instructional Material for Language Classroom<br><i>Yudi Setyaningsih</i> ..... | 79  |
| Chapter 8  | The Teaching of Second Language Reading: Teacher's Beliefs and Strategies<br><i>Utari Praba Astuti</i> .....                                    | 93  |
| Chapter 9  | EFL Learners' Ability in Writing Comparison-Contrast Essays<br><i>Abdul Muth'im</i> .....   | 105 |
| Chapter 10 | Features of Paragraphs in Research Report Abstracts Written in EFL<br><i>Elanneri Karani</i> .....  | 117 |
| Chapter 11 | Rhetoric of Research Report Introductions Written in EFL<br><i>Tanzil Huda</i> .....  | 125 |
| Chapter 12 | EFL Learners' Attitudes towards Written Corrective Feedback<br><i>Hartono</i> .....   | 133 |
| Chapter 13 | Learning Strategy Training and EFL Learners' Skill in Writing Expository Essays<br><i>Meinarni Susilowati</i> .....                             | 151 |
| Chapter 14 | Teachers' Opinions on Scaffolding L2 Learners to Become Autonomous Writers<br><i>Rahmad Husein</i> .....  | 163 |

|               |   |     |
|---------------|---|-----|
| Chapter 15    | Advice Speech Acts Performed by EFL Learners:<br>A Study of Interlanguage Pragmatic Development<br><i>Syafiyah</i> .....                      | 177 |
| Chapter 16    | Analysis of the Needs of Academic English of<br>University Lecturers<br><i>Ratna Dewi</i> .....   | 195 |
| Chapter 17    | The Effect of TOEFL iBT Coaching on Overall<br>English Proficiency<br><i>Sintha Tresnadewi</i> .....  | 213 |
| Chapter 18    | The Teaching and Learning of EFL at<br>a Pre-International Standardized School<br><i>Fathor Rasyid</i> .....                                  | 229 |
| Chapter 19    | Increasing Prospective Teachers' Awareness of the<br>Importance of SLA Theories to Support ELT Practices<br><i>Bambang Yudi Cahyono</i> ..... | 241 |
| Subject Index | .....   | 253 |

# Advice Speech Acts Performed by EFL Learners: A Study of Interlanguage Pragmatic Development

Syafiyah

*State Islamic University "Maulana Malik Ibrahim", Malang, East Java*

Language is a tool of communication. The primary function of language is to facilitate human beings with the ability to communicate. Understanding human language is therefore understanding human communication: how people communicate with each other, how communication takes place, and how people gain communicative competence. To be communicatively competent one should have both knowledge of language rules and knowledge of language use (Gass & Selinker, 1994). In other words, communicative competence includes both linguistic competence and pragmatic competence.

In the context of second language learning, it is obvious that learners need to learn more than just linguistic aspects of the target language. It is inevitably crucial to master pragmatic aspects as well as to avoid failure in communication. With respect to the importance of pragmatic competence, point out that in learning a second language one must learn not only the pronunciation, the lexical items, the appropriate word order, but one must also learn the appropriate way to use those words in the second language. This has something to do with pragmatics.

Pragmatics, in a more specific sense, refers to the way to understand and use language in context. It includes the study of how speakers use and understand utterances, and how the structure of sentences is influenced by relationships between speakers and hearers. It is therefore concerned more with what people mean by what they say, than what particular words or phrases mean literally (Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996). Huang (2007) provides

the operational definition of pragmatics as “the systematic study of meaning by virtue of or dependent on, the use of language. The central topics of inquiry of pragmatics include implicatures, presuppositions, speech acts, and deixis.”

Pragmatics can be divided into two components: sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics (Leech, 1983). Sociopragmatics is the sociological boundary of pragmatics. It refers to the social perceptions underlying participants' interpretation and performance of communicative action. Whereas pragmalinguistics refers to specific linguistic resources for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meanings. Within the domain of second language (L2) studies, pragmatics is usually referred to as interlanguage pragmatics. An interlanguage is “a stage on a continuum within a rule-governed language system that is developed by L2 learners on their path to acquire the target language. This language system is intermediate between the learner's native language and his or her target language” (Huang, 2007: 125). As the study of second language use, interlanguage pragmatics examines how nonnative speakers comprehend and produce action in a target language. As the study of second language learning, interlanguage pragmatics investigates how L2 learners develop the ability to understand and perform action in a target language (Kasper & Rose, 2002).

A number of studies have been conducted to explore speech acts in interlanguage pragmatics, some of which were cited by Ellis (1994). These studies have focused on the interlanguage Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) of requesting, apologizing, and refusing. Some of the studies investigated how a particular type of speech acts is performed by non-native speakers; some others compared and contrasted the similarities and differences in the realization of speech acts between native and non-native speakers. Other studies examining interlanguage pragmatics were done by Dufon (1999) and Mwinelle (2005). Unlike the former, these two studies focused on the acquisition of pragmatic competence. Dufon observed how learners of Indonesian acquired linguistic politeness in naturalistic interactions, while Mwinelle investigated the acquisition of advice speech act of L2 learners of Spanish in a classroom setting.

Despite the fact that studies of non-native speakers' pragmatic competence have long attracted second language researchers, most of them have addressed questions relating to non-native speakers' comprehension and production of L2 pragmatics meaning, their interaction in different settings,



and pragmatic aspects of foreign or second language use. In other words, the pragmatics of non-native speakers has largely been studied as an issue of L2 use, not as that of L2 development. There are still few studies addressing the issue of L2 pragmatic development. Of these were Achiba's (2002) and Ellis' (1992) studies which provide a good starting point for describing the development of requests in a second language. Next was a study conducted by Matsumura (2003) which was intended to give an explanation for the different levels of pragmatic development among university-level Japanese learners of English as functions of their varying levels of English proficiency and amount of exposure to English.

This is indeed not an expected state of affairs because, ideally speaking, examination of pragmatic ability should be met with adequate interest in the ways such ability develops in order to better understand the different uses to which such ability is put, or to cultivate L2 pragmatic development as a domain within second language acquisition research, or to establish a research basis for instruction of L2 pragmatics.

On the basis of this, it is considered important to conduct this study which is intended to investigate the L2 pragmatic development of English learners. In particular, this study aims to:

1. Describe the realization of advice speech act by L2 learners of English with different levels of proficiency.
2. Describe the development patterns of the acquisition of advice speech act.

## **METHOD**

This study is a cross-sectional study applying a descriptive qualitative approach. The subjects of the study were two groups of the first year students of the English department of State Islamic University of Malang who had different levels of English proficiency. The English level was determined on the basis of scores they obtained from the final test of the first term of English intensive course. The students of pre-intermediate level were those whose scores were around 60-70 while the upper-intermediate students were those who scored 80-90. There were 4 subjects for pre-intermediate level and 5 subjects for upper intermediate level.

To elicit the data of advice speech act realization, a written Discourse Completion Task (DCT) was used. The DCT provided five different situa-

tions in which the subjects were required to perform appropriate advice speech act (see Table 1).

**Table 1. The DCT Situations**

| Situations | Description   | Social Distance |
|------------|---|-----------------|
| A          | Giving advice to a friend having a problem with his or her roommate.  | -SD             |
| B          | Giving advice to a lecturer having a problem with his or her mobile phone.  | +SD             |
| C          | Giving advice to a best friend feeling upset for losing a lover.  | -SD             |
| D          | Giving advice to a close friend addicted to drugs.  | -SD             |
| E          | Giving advice to a friend's mother feeling distressed addicted to drugs because her son has been addicted to drugs. | +SD             |

The learner's advice realization was then analyzed descriptively for the a) head act, b) level of directness, and c) level of politeness. The theoretical framework for analysis was adapted from Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989).

**Table 2. Strategies of Advice Realization in Terms of Directness of the Head Act (Adapted from Blum-Kulka et al., 1989)**

| No | Level of Directness                  | Strategies              | Description and Examples  |
|----|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 1. | Direct (marked explicitly as advice) | Mood<br>Derivable       | The mood of the verb signals a command such as imperatives. E.g., <i>Stop consuming drugs.</i>  |
| 2. |                                      | Performative            | The illocutionary force is explicitly named. E.g., <i>I suggest that you stop consuming drugs.</i>                                      |
| 3. |                                      | Hedged<br>Performative  | The naming of the illocutionary force is modified by hedging expressions. E.g., <i>I'd like to suggest you to stop consuming drugs.</i> |
| 4. |                                      | Obligation<br>Statement | Stating the obligation of the hearer to carry out the act. E.g., <i>You'll have to avoid drugs.</i>                                     |

| No | Level of Directness   | Strategies            | Description and Examples   |
|----|---|-----------------------|--|
| 5. |   | Want Statement        | Stating the speaker's desire that the hearer carry out the act. E.g., <i>I want you to stop consuming drugs. I wish you could stop consuming drugs.</i>          |
| 6. | Conventionally indirect (referring to contextual preconditions necessary for its performance as conventionalized in the language) | Suggestory Formula    | Utterances that contain a suggestion to do something. E.g., <i>How about seeing a doctor as soon as possible?</i>  |
| 7. |   | Preparatory Condition | Utterances which contain a reference to preparatory conditions. E.g., <i>Could you stop consuming drugs?</i>   |
| 8. | Non-conventionally indirect (partially referring to the object depending on contextual clues).                                    | Strong Hints          | An utterance that contains partial reference to object of element needed for the implementation of the act. E.g., <i>You are seriously damaging your life.</i>   |
| 9. |   | Mild Hints            | A utterance that makes no reference to the advice proper (or any of its elements) but are interpretable as advice by context. E.g., <i>You need to keep fit.</i> |

The level of politeness was analyzed by considering the level of directness, the use of politeness markers, and the use of advice modification, all of which cover either internal or external modification. The internal modification includes lexical, phrasal, or syntactic downgraders and upgraders that serve to soften or intensify the force of the advice (see Table 3). The results of analysis of the data gathered from the two groups were then compared to observe the patterns of the development.

**Table 3. Types of Downgraders/Upgraders**

|                       | Types                | Description and Examples   |
|-----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Syntactic downgraders | Interrogative        | <i>Could you do the cleaning up?</i>                             |
|                       | Negation             | <i>I wonder if you wouldn't mind buying the new one from me.</i> |
|                       | Past Tense           | <i>I wanted to ask for a postponement.</i>                       |
|                       | Embedded "If" Clause | <i>I would appreciate it if you left me alone.</i>               |

|                             | Types                | Description and Examples   |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Lexical/Phrasal Downgraders | Consultative Devices | The speaker seeks to involve the hearer and bids for his/her cooperation. E.g., <i>Do you think you can take him a rehabilitation centre?</i>                |
|                             | Understaters         | The speaker minimizes the required action or object. E.g., <i>Could you tidy up a bit before I start?</i>  |
|                             | Hedges               | The speaker avoids specification regarding the request. E.g., <i>It would really helpful if you <b>did something</b> about the kitchen.</i>                  |
|                             | Downtoner            | The speaker modulates the impact of the advice by signaling the possibility of non-compliance. E.g., <i>You can perhaps give him more attention support.</i> |
|                             | Politeness Device    | <i>Can I use your pen for a minute, <b>please</b>?</i>   |
| Upgraders                   | Intensifiers         | <i>The speaker over-represents the reality. Clean up this mess, it's disgusting.</i>   |
|                             | Expletives           | The speaker explicitly expresses negative emotional attitudes. E.g., <i>You still haven't cleaned up that <b>bloody</b> mess!</i>                            |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the results of data analysis which will be classified into three sections: the realization of advice by pre-intermediate students, the realization of advice by upper-intermediate students, and the development of second language pragmatics. All of the transcripts of data from the students are written as original.

### Realization of Advice by Pre-Intermediate Students

The students of pre-intermediate level realize the advice speech act in different ways. However, the strategies employed are mostly direct strategies which cover mood derivable and statement of obligation regardless of the context in which the advice act is performed. They also apply little modification in realizing the act. The following is the detailed data analysis and discussion of the findings for each situation.

In situation A, the subject is expected to give advice to his or her friend who has just moved to a dormitory and faces a problem with his or her new roommate because he or she cannot keep the room clean and comfortable. Each subject's realization of advice speech act can be seen in the following data.

**Data 1. Situation A (Giving advice to a friend having a problem with a new roommate)**

- (1.1) S-1: You should think of another person's want. You should think something that you did.
- (1.2) S-2: Say, (your) turn to clean this room.
- (1.3) S-3: I have some advices for you. First, give her understanding. If she still does it, you can talk to her about your problem.
- (1.4) S-4: You have to right explain to your friend. You say that clean make you comfortable.

The data indicates that all subjects use direct strategies of giving advice. However, they are different in the choice of type of strategy. Mood derivable strategy is chosen by S-2 since the verb used (1.2), "Say,...", signals a direct command to do something as a solution to the problem. Performative strategy is used by S-3. This subject explicitly names the illocutionary force by saying (1.3), "*I give you advices,....*". The other two subjects begin the advice by obligating the advisee to do something in their statements (1.1), "*You should think....*", and (1.4), "*You have to explain...*" which is categorized as obligation statement strategy. The data also show that all subjects do not use mitigators either by using lexical or syntactic downgraders to soften the advice. However, one subject, S-4, uses upgraders to intensify the force of advice through her statement (1.4), "*You say that clean make you comfortable*".

In the next situation, the subject is supposed to give advice to his or her lecturer who has a new cellular phone which does not work properly and the subject is supposed to be a student who also sells second-hand mobile phones. The following data provides the advice speech act performance of each subject.

### **Data 2: Situation B (Giving advice to a lecturer)**

- (2.1) S-1: You must be patient to face the problem.
- (2.2) S-2: Don't be sad. Take your cellular phone and bring to reparation cell phone.
- (2.3) S-3: A new something negligible good, probably look nice but not to use it. In my suggest, be careful if we buy something.
- (2.4): S-4: You bring it to the service if you have problem.

It can be seen from the data that in the situation in which there is a social distance between the advisor and the advisee (student-lecturer), the subjects keep using direct strategies in performing the act of advice. The first subject, S-1, directly obligates the advisee to be patient in her statement of obligation (2.1), "*You must be patient...*". Meanwhile, S-2 applies mood derivable strategy by directly giving the advisee a command to do something as indicated in the following excerpt (2.2), "*Take your cellular phone to...*". Before this advice head act, S-2 starts the advice with a supportive more strategy showing her empathy as indicated in her expression (2.2), "*Don't be sad...*" S-3 uses performative strategy since he explicitly names the act in the following advice realization (2.3), "*In my suggest (suggestion), ...*". This statement is followed by an imperative and a conditional statement (2.3), "*...be careful if we buy something*". From this excerpt, it can also be seen, although the subject utilizes a direct strategy, he tries to use the first person plural "we" as if he was avoiding blaming the advisee. This can be regarded as an attempt to soften the advice. S-4 seems to apply mood derivable. However, instead of using an imperative, an affirmative statement to express imperative meaning has been used. This can be observed in this excerpt (2.4), "*You bring to...*".

The following situation provides a context in which the subject has to give advice to his/her best friend feeling very distressed for losing a lover.

### **Data 3: Situation C (Giving advice to a best friend)**

- (3.1) S-1: You must not think of him, because he has another girl. If you just think about him, it disturbs your study.
- (3.2) S-2: Don't give up because your parents hope you to be success and be sure you'll get the best boy friend.
- (3.3) S-3: To my best friend, whatever will be will be. Forget him. There are many boys in the world.

(3.4) S-4: Life must go on. No man to cry. Always smile. Don't forget to pray.

The data show that in giving advice to a very close friend, just as in the first two situations, each subject uses direct strategies. This can be seen from the following head acts (3-1) "*You must not think of him*", (3.2) "*Don't give up*", (3.3) "*Forget him*", and (3.4) "*Always smile. Don't forget to pray*". S-1 uses statement of obligation strategy, while the other three subjects apply mood derivable by using imperative or negative imperatives in which the mood of the verbs uses signals as a command. The data also indicate that all subjects have tried to make use of supportive move strategies in different ways in order to mitigate the face threatening force of advice. S-1 and S-2 explain the reasons for the advice as in these excerpts (3.1) "*...because he has another girl...*," and (3.2) "*...because your parents...*," S-3 starts the advice with an alerter (3.3) "*to my best friend*" to show intimacy and before giving advice he prepares the advisee for the upcoming advice with a disarmer (3.3) "*Whatever will be will be*" in order to remove potential objections, just as S-4 does through he statements (3.4) "*Life must go on...*".

In the next situation, the subject gives advice to a close friend who has shown uncontrolled behavior because of being addicted to drugs. The advice speech act performance can be observed in the following data:

**Data 4: Situation D (Giving advice to a close friend addicted to drugs)**

(4.1) S-1: You shouldn't use drugs again, because you are disappointed with your parents. Drugs just destroy yourself.

(4.2) S-2: You should go to a doctor and must do what the doctor says to you.

(4.3) S-3: Far it. It makes you broke. Warning, your life is so long and it's not good for you.

(4.4) S-4: It makes you poor. You don't have friends. You don't have much money and another.

It is interesting to note that in this situation, not all subjects use direct strategies. Meanwhile, three subjects keep preferring direct strategies in giving advice and still employ statement of obligation as in these extracts

(4.1) "*You shouldn't use...*", (4.2) "*You should go to (see) a doctor...*", and

(4.3) "*(keep) far (away from) it...*". S.4 tries to apply a non-conventionally

indirect strategy by giving strong hints in his words (4.4) "*It makes you poor. You don't have friends....*" The advisor means to suggest that consuming drugs makes him poor, consequently his friends may leave him. These hints contain partial reference to object of elementary needed for the implementation of the advice. There is no direct advice given by S-4. It can also be noticed from the data that there are two subjects, S-1 and S-2, who use supportive move strategies. In both S-1's and S-3's advice, the supportive moves appear after the head acts. The S-1's supportive move (4.1) "*because you are disappointed with your parents ...*" and the S-2's (4.2) "*it makes you broke...*" explain the reasons or justification for the advice which can be categorized as grounders.

The last situation presents a context in which the subject has to give advice to her/his friend's mother who feels very upset because her soon is addicted to drugs.

#### **Data 5: Situation E (Giving advice to a friend's mother)**

- (5.1) S-1: You shouldn't think of your son hardly, because even though you advise him but he still do it. Don't be sad, because you have given him advice.
- (5.2) S-2: Mom, stop him step by step and do it again.
- (5.3) S-3: He need attention. Please bring him to rehabilitation organization.
- (5.4) S-4: You have a lot of attention to him. Bring you son to hospital.

In this situation, the advisor and the advisee do not have very close relationship. Yet, the data do not show any strategies used by the subjects are significantly different from the ones intended for hearers without any social distance such as those in situations A, C, and D. All subjects utilize directs direct strategies by applying either statement of obligation such as (5.1) "*You shouldn't think ...*", and (5.4) *You have to give...*", or mood derivable as in (5.1) "*Don't be sad...*", (5.2) "*Stop him*", (5.3) *Please bring him to...*", and (5.4) *Bring your son...*". The data also indicate that in attempt to modify the advice, S-1 offers justification for his advice which can be considered an advice supportive move. This can be seen from her sentence (5.1) "*...because even though you advice him but he still do (does) it*". In the S-3's advice, the supportive move (5.3) "*He need (needs) attention...*" appears before the head act which is intended to prepare the advisee for the up-



coming advice. She also uses a lexical downgrader (5.3) "Please...", which is a politeness marker, in order to soften the force of the advice.

### Realization of Advice by Upper-Intermediate Level Students

The instrument used to elicit data from the students of upper-intermediate level was the same with the one for pre-intermediate level students. The following are the data and result of analysis for each situation:

#### Data 6: Situation A (Giving advice to a friend having a problem with his or her new roommate)

- (6.1) S-5: Maybe you can say about your complaint to her slowly.
- (6.2) S-6: You should tell your roommate that you dislike dirty room.
- (6.3) S-7: Be patient and give her explanation. I'm sure she can understand.
- (6.4) S-8: You should be patient person. Why don't you try to ask her to clean the room together?
- (6.5) S-9: I think, you should make some large note and write "Keep the room clean". And it's very useful if you make cleaning schedule for all of roommates.

The data reveal that the strategies used in performing advice speech acts vary. Both direct and indirect strategies are found in the data. The following excerpts (6.3) "Give her explanation...", (6.2) "You should tell your roommate...", and (6.5) *You should make...* can be categorized as impositives or direct strategies using mood derivable and statement of obligation respectively, whereas these excerpts (6.4) "Why don't you try to ask her...?" (6.1) *You can say about your complaint ...*, and (6.5) "It's very useful if you make..." can be classified into conventionally indirect strategies using conventionalized suggestory formulae since the expressions contain suggestion do the act.

It is interesting to note that the data also show attempts made by the subjects to modify the advice. S-5 starts with a lexical downgrader (6.1) "Maybe you can ..." which is a downtoner functioning as a sentence modifier to moderate the force of the advice on the advisee. S-7 uses a supportive move strategy as a grounder after the head act in her statement (6.3) "I'm sure she can understand" in order to offer justification. S-9 begins the advice with a phrasal downgrader (6.5) "I think..." which is a subjectiviser expressing the advisor's subjective opinion.

### **Data 7: Situation B (Giving advice to a lecturer)**

- (7.1) S-5: Sir, maybe you can return the cell phone to the seller and tell him about your complaint.
- (7.2) S-6: One day, if you will buy a second hand mobile phone. I will sell the good one for you.
- (7.3) S-7: Maybe there is something wrong with your mobile phone. You should check it. It's important to bring it to the service centre. If you need the new one probably I can help you.
- (7.4) S-8: Can I help you, Sir? I know a little about mobile phone. Maybe I can see the problem and repair it. But if the problem is serious, you can repair it at a certain shop.
- (7.5) S-9: It's okay. I think you should be patient. We need time.

It can be seen from the data that in the situation in which there is a social distance between the advisor and the advisee, the subjects mostly employ indirect strategies as indicated in the advice speech act realization by S-5 (7.1) "*You can return...*". This advice is classified into conventionally indirect strategy in the form of suggestory formulae. Another indirect strategy can be observed in the following excerpt (7.2) "*...if you will buy a second hand mobile phone, I will sell the good one for you*". Using if-clause, the advisor tries to minimize the cost indicating consideration of the imposition to the advisee in compliance with the advice to buy a good mobile phone from the advisor. Other indirect strategies are found in the following advice head acts (7.3) "*It's important to bring it to the service centre*", and (7.4) "*You can repair it a certain shop*". Both can be categorized as conventionally indirect strategies using suggestory formulae. Some indirect strategies are also used by the subjects as indicated in these excerpts (7.3) "*You should check it*" and "*I think you should be patient*" which can be considered obligation statement in which the advisor obligates the advisee to do something.

Along with both direct and indirect strategies, internal modification with downgraders and external modification with downgraders and external modification of advice through the use of supportive moves are also employed by the subjects. For instance, in performing the act of advice, S-5, starts with an alerter or attention getter (7.1) "*Sir, maybe you can return...*" which is an address term for a man with higher social status, and a downtoner (7.1) "*Maybe*" with a view to modulate the impact of the advice by signaling the possibility of non-compliance. S-8 makes use of several supportive moves

before performing the head act. She begins with offering help (7.4) "Can I help you, Sir?" to show that she is ready to help the advisee solve the problem. Then, she uses grounder type of strategy by giving justification as in (7.4) "I know a little about mobile phone...".

#### **Data 8: Situation C (Giving advice to a best friend)**

- (8.1) S-5: Come on girl. There are many boys in the world, not only him. You can find the better boy. Don't be sad.
- (8.2) S-6: You have to forget your boy friend. You must think about your study. Do some activities in order to forget him.
- (8.3) S-7: The show must go on, friend. Don't let the sadness make you more complicated.
- (8.4) S-8: Don't be sad, please. I know what you feel. But if you always like this, it will disturb your study. Be patient. Step by step you should try to accept the fact. God will give you the best.
- (8.5) S-9: There isn't only one boy in this world. Why do you think about him if he doesn't think about you. Let me help you to find someone else.

The data show that in this kind of situation, the subjects mostly choose direct strategies. Such excerpts as (8.1) "Don't be sad", (8.2) "Do some activities in order to forget him", (8.3) "Don't let the sadness...", and (8.4) "Be patient" are categorized as mood derivable strategies. The mood of the verbs in these excerpts signals a command to do something. Some other sentences such as (8.2) "You have to forget your boyfriend" and (8.2) "You must think about your study" are classified into statement of obligation in which the phrases (8.2) "You have to" and (8.2) "You must..." state the obligation of the advisee to carry out the intended act. In addition to this, there is one indirect strategy that can be found in the data. The S-9's advice head act (8.5) "Why do you think about him if he doesn't think about you?" can be regarded as a non-conventionally indirect strategy with strong hints containing partial reference to object of element needed for the implementation of the act. The advice is that because the advisee's boyfriend does not think about the advisee, the advisee should not think about him.

The data also show various ways of modification of advice that have been made by the subjects. S-5 uses a very friendly alerter strategy (8.1) "Come on girl" to show closeness and to make the advisee ready to listen to

the advisor. The next part (8.1) "*There are many boys...*" provides a supportive move functioning as justification for the advice. In S-7's statement (8.3) "*The show must go on, friend*", another supportive move is found. It is used to prepare the advisee for an upcoming advice and to remove potential objection to the advice. This intention is strengthened by the use of an intimate address term (8.3) "...*friend*". A supportive move is used to show empathy or a sense of understanding of the advisee's predicament can be seen in S-8's expression (8.4) "*I know what you feel...*". While S-9 shows empathy by offering help in his supportive move (8.5) "*Let me help you to find someone else.*"

**Data 9: Situation D (Giving advice to a close friend addicted to drugs)**

- (9.1) S-5: Drug is really not important for you. It's dangerous for your body. So leave it.
- (9.2) S-6: You must free yourself from drugs. You must consider your parents. You've disappointed him.
- (9.3) S-7: Friend, I'm sure you must be in a serious problem. Don't be hopeless. You have to have strong motivation to get better condition.
- (9.4) S-8: I hope you can stop consuming drugs. It's very dangerous for your body. You should also remember your parents and your study.
- (9.5) S-9: Don't you make your parents feel upset. Think about that. Drugs have made you suffer. If you want to stop it. I promise I'll help you.

From the data it can be noticed that direct strategies are used more in this context than indirect strategies. Some examples of direct advice giving which can be observed are (9.1) "...*leave it*", (9.2) "*You must free yourself from drugs*". Unlike in other situations, in addition to mood derivable and statement of obligation, want statement –in which the advisor states his desire that the advisee carry out the intended act- is also applied. This can be seen in this excerpt "*I hope you can...*". whereas the use of indirect strategy is shown in the following excerpt (9.5) "*If you want to stop it, I promise I'll help you*". In this advise realization the subject uses internal modification by applying embedded if clause which is categorized as a syntactic downgrader. An interesting modification strategy can be observed in S-7's advice realization. S-7 starts with an intimate address term (9.3) "*friend,...*" and goes on with an expression showing empathy or sense of understanding of the advisee's problem as indicated in the following excerpt (9.3) "...*I'm*

sure you must be in a serious problem". After the head act she also uses a supportive move (9.3) "everyone believes you can stop" as a sweetener.

**Data 10: Situation E (Giving advice to a friend's mother)**

- (10.1) S-5: Be patient please, where there is a will there is a way. I'm sure that your son can leave drugs. So never stop giving him advice and support.
- (10.2) S-6: Put your son at a rehabilitation of drugs. Give your attention and love to him. Your son needs you. Don't think of your son too much at the workplace, it's disturbing.
- (10.3) S-7: Please be patient whatever the condition. Don't let your son feel alone. You have to give him motivation. You have to be sure, everything will be better.
- (10.4) S-8: Everything needs a process. We can help him step by step. We should take care of him and support him. Your son needs you. Let's think how to help him.
- (10.5) S-9: I think you should take him to hospital. It's important for him to be quarantined.

It is interesting to find out in this situation that the relation between the advisor and the advisee is not very close, the subjects are quite direct and straightforward in giving advice. For example, in the following excerpts (10.1) "Be patient, please", (10.1) "never stop giving him advice and support", (10.2) "put your son.....", and (10.2) "give your attention ..." they employ mood derivable strategy. While the data (10.3) "you have to give him motivation...", and (10.5) "it's important for him to ...." show the uses of statement of obligation strategy by the subjects. The application of indirect strategy can be found in data (10.5) "it's important for him to...." in which the subject uses a conventionally indirect suggestory formulae. In data (10.4) it can be seen that the subject uses first person plural to soften the force of advice such as (10.4) "we should take care of him...", and an expression using first person plural imperative (10.4) "Let's think how to help him". The use of first person plural in these excerpts is expected to avoid blaming and giving burden to the advisee.

There are several ways of modifying the advice realization which can be observed from the data in this context. In datum (10.5), for instance, we can see the use of politeness marker "....., please" and supportive moves

"where there is a will there is a way. I'm sure that your son can leave drugs." Which are grounders to provide justification for the upcoming advice. In datum (10.2) "... it's disturbing" it can be seen that the subject uses an upgrader to intensify the force of advice. In datum (10.5) the subject uses a phrasal downgrader "I think ..." which is a subjectiviser expressing the advisor's subjective opinion.

### Development of Second Language Pragmatics

The results reveal that the students of pre-intermediate level perform the advice speech act differently from those of upper-intermediate level. The differences indicate development in the pragmatic competence of the students for the advice speech act.

The data have proven that regardless of different contexts and addressees, pre-intermediate students use more direct advice without softener, less modification, and fewer politeness markers. While the upper-intermediate students show better competence in realizing advice speech act which is marked by the ability to use different strategies with different addressees in different situations, more indirect strategies or direct strategies with softeners, more modification, and more politeness markers. For example, in situation A, in which the students have to give advice to a friend having a problem with a roommate, lower level students use direct strategies without any mitigators as can be seen in these excerpts (1.1) "*You should think of another person want...*", (1.6) "*Say...*", (1.7) "*I have some advices for you. First, give her....*", and (1.8) "*you have to right explain...*". In the same situation, the higher level students make more modification by using internal modifications such as a lexical downgrader in (6.1) "*Maybe you can say...*", a phrasal modification in (6.5) "*I think you should make...*", and an external modification or a supportive move in (S-7) "*I'm sure she can understand*".

Another example can be observed in the realization of advice in situation B in which the students give advice to a lecture. In the context where there is a social distance between the advisor and the advisee, the lower level students use the same strategy as in situation A. this is indicated in these data (2.1) "*You must be patient.....*", (2.2) "*Don't be sad. Take your.....*", (2.3) "*In my suggest, be careful.....*", and (2.4) "*You bring to.....*". These direct strategies are used by the students without using any mitigating devices and politeness markers. Unlike the lower level students, the higher level students show better competence in selecting more appropriate ex-

expressions in accordance with the context. This can be proven by the data showing the use of an appropriate address term as an alerter and a downtoner in (7.1) "Sir, maybe you can....", and the use of a supportive move in (7.4) "Can I help you, Sir? I know a little about...." before stating the head act to offer justification.

Moreover, the higher level students are evidently able to use more various strategies of giving advice either by using direct strategies. For example, datum (9.4) "I hope you can stop consuming drugs" shows she use of wants statement which is not found in any data of lower students. The use of more various indirect strategies by upper-intermediate students can be seen in these excerpt (6.4) "Why don't you try to ask her to clean the room together?" (7.1) "It's important to bring it to the service centre," and (10.4) "Let's think how to help him." All these data can be classified into conventionally indirect strategies using suggestory formulae since the expressions contain suggestion to do the act.

## CONCLUSION

This study has come up with the realization of advice speech act by two different levels of students. It has been found out that the pre-intermediate students mostly employ direct strategies which cover mood derivable and statement of obligation irrespective of the context in which the advice act is performed. Another strategy used is performative strategy which appears in only one utterance. The study also shows that the lower level students apply little modification in realizing the act and use fewer politeness markers. On the contrary, the upper-intermediate students perform the advice speech act in more various ways depending upon the context in which the advice is given. In a situation where the advisor has close relationship with the advisee, the strategies used are mostly direct strategies which include mood derivable and statement of obligation. Other direct strategies are also widely used by the higher level students, especially when the students feel there is a social distance between the advisor and the advisee. The indirect strategy mostly applied is suggested formula which is regarded as a conventionally indirect strategy. In addition to applying different strategies, the higher level students use more internal or external modification by using either lexical, phrasal, or syntactic dowgraders and supportive moves, and more politeness markers.

The differences of the advice speech act realization by the two different levels of students indicate the pattern of pragmatic development. With the improvement of the competence, students are able to employ more various and more appropriate strategies in according with the context. Due to the limitation of this cross-sectional study which involves a limited number of subjects, further research need to be done to observe more comprehensively the pattern of development using a longitudinal study.

## REFERENCES

- Achiba, M. 2002. *Learning to Request in a Second Language: Child Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Bachman, L. M. 1990. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. 1989. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Dufon, M. A. 1999. *The Acquisition of Linguistic Politeness in Indonesian as a Second Language by Sojourners in Naturalistic Interactions*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Hawai'i: The University of Hawai'i.
- Halliday, M. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Arnold.
- Hymes, D. 1979. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ellis, R. 1992. Learning to Communicate in the Classroom: A Study of Two Learners' Requests. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14: 1-23.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. 1994. *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher.
- Huang, Y. 2007. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. 2002. *Pragmatics Development in a Second Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsumura, S. 2003. Modeling the Relationships among Interlanguage pragmatic Development, L2 Proficiency, and Exposure to L2. *Applied Linguistics*, 24: 465-491.
- Mwinnyelle, J. B. 2005. *The Acquisition of Pragmatic Competence in an L2 Classroom: Giving Advice in Spanish*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.